| States | Number |
|---|---|
| 8. Karnataka | 16220 |
| 9. Kerala | 14562 |
| 10 Madhya Pradesh | 39052 |
| 11. Maharashtra | 21029 |
| 12. Manipur | 1266 |
| 13. Meghalaya | 14 |
| 14. Nagaland | 225 |
| 15. Orissa | 9511 |
| 16. Punjab | 9674 |
| 17. Rajasthan | 12243 |
| 18. Sikkim* | |
| 19. Tamilnadu | 34596 |
| 20. Tripura | 383 |
| 21. Uttar Pradesh | 17455 |
| 22. West Bengal | 8485 |
| *Union Territories* | |
| 1. Andaman & Nicob r Islands | 140 |
| 2. Arunachal Pradesh** | |
| 3. Chandigarh | 1756 |
| 4. Dadra and Nagar H veli** | |
| 5. Delhi | 23101 |
| 6. Goa | 1284 |
| 7. Lakshadweep | 114 |
| 8. Mizoram | 342 |
| 9. Pondicherry | 896 |
| ALL IN IA TOTAL : | 275777 |

NOTE 1. *No Employment Exchange is functioning in Sikkim and Arunachal Pradesh.

2. **One Employment Exchange is functioning in this Union Territory, but data are not being received.

79. *[Transferred to the 61I1 August** 1985].

**Irregularities in Luckno$_w$ T.V. Cenlrc**

SO. SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether any officers' team was sent from (he headquarters at Delhi to Luck-now TV Centre during the last few months to look into any charges of irregularities: and

(b) if so, what is the report and what action has been taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI V. N. GADGIL): (a) Yes, Sir. A senior officer from the Directorate General, Doordar-shan was deputed in January, 1985 to make an on-the-spot study of a number of complaints received against the functioning of the DDK, Lucknow.

(b) The informal inquiry revealed that whereas the allegations formally levelled were largely baseless, there was a ground to believ$_e$ that affairs of the Kendra were being handled rather ineptly. The situation is being rectified suitably.

**Violation of Contract Labour Regulation and Abolition) Central Rules. im**

374. SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have recently received any representation in regard to the violation of Contract Labour (Regu lation and Abolition) Central Rules. 1971 in steel and fertilizer industries: and

(b) if so, what steps have been taken in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI T. ANJAIAH): (a) and (b) Complaints have been received from time to time alleging violation of different provisions of Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition)

Central Rules, 1971 in Steel as well as in Fertilizer Industries. The concealed State Government is the 'Appropriate Government' under the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act 1970 for Fertilizer and Steel Industries. Complaints as and when received have been referred to the respective State Govern-ment(s) for appropriate action.

I low ever, in order to have a uniform policy in the Steel Industry under the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act. 1970, the Central Government has declared Steel Industry as 'Controlled Industry' vide Notification No. S. 16011/ l/83-LW-Vol. II dated 17-6-1985. The Central Government will be the Appropriate Government* for two years in respect of Steel Industry with effect from the date on which the above mentioned Notification is published in the Gazette.

**Failure reports on Labour dispute.,**

375. SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to stale the number of failure reports on labour disputes which have been received by his Ministry during the last three years and their disposal?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI T. AN-JALAH): During the last three years *viz.,* 1982—84, 6,050. Failure of conciliation Reports were received by th$_e$ Ministry of Labour. 2,361 disputes were referred to adjudication and in 3,678 cases adjudication was declined. These include Failure of Conciliation Reports carried over from the previous years. Decision on 139 disputes is pending.

**Prohibiting employment of contract Labour in magnesite mines**

376. SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that som$_e$ man-agements have challenged the order pro-hibiting employment of contract labour in magnesite mines;

(b) whether it is also a fact that a re-presentation has been made to Government about amending the prohibitory order by including the individual undertakings as well: arid

(c) if so. the decision taken by Govern-ment in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI i. AN-JAIAH): (a) On the recommendation of the Contract Labour Central Advisory Board, the Central Government have prohibited employment of contract labour in the following jobs|operations|categories of work vide Notification No. SO 4307 dated 20-11-1984 published on 8-12-1984: —

1. *Chromite Mines:* (1) over-burden excavation and removal; (2) Drilling and Blasting: (3) Raising of Ore and (41 Transportation of over-burden to dumps and Ore to 'stocking sites.

2. *Magnetite Mines:* (1) Over-burden removal; (2) Drilling and Blasting; and (3) Raising of Minerals.

3. *Gypsum Mines:* (1) Over-burden removal; and (2) Mining/raising of Mineral.

4. *Mica Mines:* ( 1 ) Raising of Mica; (2) Drilling and Blasting; (3) Dewater-ing of Mines: (4) Muck removal: and (5) Processing of Mica.

Some of the employers of the aforesaid Mines including Magnesite Mines have challenged the said Notification and filed Writ Petitions/Applications in various High Courts. In a few cases the High Courts have passed stay orders against the implementation of the aforesaid Notification. The matter is *sub-judice,*

(b) and (c) Yes, Sir. As the matter is *sub-judice,* no decision has been taken.